Appl. No. 09/838,852
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 21 June 2004

Page 4 of 5

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application.

The Office action rejects:

claims 1-2 and 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Trika et al. (USP 6,630,931, hereinafter Trika) and Bekaert et al. ("Viewing in 3D", hereinafter Bekaert);

claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Trika, Bekaert, and Gray III et al. (USP 5,856,829, hereinafter Gray);

claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Trika, Bekaert, Woodgate et al. (USP 5,808,792, hereinafter Woodgate), and Halle ("Autostereoscopic Displays and Computer Graphics");

claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Trika, Bekaert, and Nelson et al. (USP 6,014,144, hereinafter Nelson); and

claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Trika, Bekaert, Woodgate, and Halle.

The applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-5 depend, claims a method of generating a plurality of images for display of a 3D scene from different viewpoints, and claim 6 upon which claims 7-8 depend, claims an apparatus generating a plurality of images for display of a 3D scene from different viewpoints. In each of these independent claims 1 and 6, a first axis value of a first image is updated by an amount substantially equal to $k*dx/w$, where k is a constant, dx is a displacement value, and w is a homogeneity value.

The Office action asserts that Trika teaches updating an image by an amount equal to $k*dx/w$. The applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion.

The applicant teaches and claims that the displacement value, dx, is directly proportional to an offset of a viewpoint of a subsequent image from a first viewpoint.

The Office action asserts that the sum K_1+K_2 of Trika corresponds to the applicant's claimed displacement value. Thus, for Trika to teach the applicant's claimed invention, Trika's update value must be substantially equal to $k*(K_1+K_2)/w$, where k is a constant.

Appl. No. 09/838,852
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 21 June 2004

Page 5 of 5

The applicant notes that Trika's terms K_1 and K_2 are defined by equations 11 and 12 in Trika, and that the X axis value is updated as defined by equation 10. Equation 10 states that the update amount is equal to $K_1+K_2*Z_v$, where Z_v is defined in equation 9. Equation 9 states that Z_v is equal to $VCZ + (Z_w-WCZ)*(VSZ/WSZ)$, where Z_w is defined in equation 5 as being equal to z_a/w.

Thus, Trika's update amount equals $K_1+K_2*(VCZ +((z_a/w)-WCZ)*(VSZ/WSZ))$. The applicant respectfully maintains that Trika's equation for the update amount is substantially different from the applicant's claimed value of $k*(K_1+K_2)/w$, where k is a constant.

Because neither Trika, nor Bekaert, nor Gray, nor Woodgate, nor Halle, individually or collectively, teaches or suggests an update amount that is substantially equal to $k*dx/w$, as specifically claimed in each of the applicant's invention, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the above rejections.

In view of the foregoing, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert M. McDermott, Attorney
Registration Number 41,508
patents@lawyer.com

1824 Federal Farm Road
Montross, VA 22520
Phone: 804-493-0707
Fax: 215-243-7525